

Two Types of *That*-clause

Fumio Sekine

1. Introduction

This paper is intended as a sequel to my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham (1996). What will be dealt with in this short article—two types of *that*-clause with different grammatical characters—has at least some formal similarities to the so-called ‘content *that*-clause’, one of the most intensively investigated topics in my thesis.¹⁾ One of these two types of *that*-clause is closely associated with, and the other often wrongly interpreted as (see, for example, Halliday 1994: 272, Fig. 7-17), a content *that*-clause. The first one is a *that*-clause in a cleft sentence, and the second an adverbial *that*-clause in sentences exemplified by *It’s not that we don’t love each other*. The analysis will be inevitably short and made in a rather summary fashion, because the main purpose of this paper is just to clarify how these clauses are similar or dissimilar to our content *that*-clause.

My basic standpoint is functional in a broad sense and my analysis is data-based, with much importance being placed on the role played by contexts, linguistic and otherwise. I believe that certain formal properties of sentences cannot be fully understood without looking at the contexts in which the sentences having these properties are embedded, although it must be added in haste that I am prepared to admit that there will not be any absolute one-to-one correspondence found between the grammatical structure, the semantic structure and the pragmatic organization of sentences.

2. *That*-clause in the cleft sentence

It is not intended here to try to reach even a provisional answer to the whole problem surrounding the highly complicated structure of the *it*-cleft sentence. The issue will be gone into only deep enough to point out (A) that THAT used in this construction, when

(1)

looked at from the point of view of the interclausal relationship, could be taken as a syntactic blend of relative and paratactic constructions and (B) that one of the most important aspects of this construction, that is, its information structure, has been subject to greatly misguided and incorrect interpretation in most researches. The conclusions which will be drawn from the present analysis are: (A) a *that*-clause of this type constitutes a class of its own and cannot be taken as another kind of pure relative and (B) the traditional view on the information structure pertaining to this construction must be drastically reviewed.

2.1. Basic syntactic and semantic features of the cleft sentence

The cleft sentence typically takes the following surface form:

It is/was + X + that/who/which, etc. + Finite clause

What comes in the place of 'X' in this formula is a constituent of the sentence which has been displaced from that sentence because it is *somehow* 'focused' (therefore, called hereafter a 'focused' element). It is precisely this 'focusing' process that semantically distinguishes the inner clause of a cleft sentence (called hereafter a 'focusing' clause) from the restrictive relative clause. The cleft sentence is used as a most versatile stylistic device to signify that the element X is marked off as the focus of information from the rest of the clause headed by *that/who/which, etc.*, while the restrictive relative clause is used to restrict grammatically the semantic scope of its antecedent. To see clearly how this basic semantic distinction between the two types of clause is reflected in their surface forms, they are compared below with respect to their formal similarities and dissimilarities.

Similarities

- (1) The same kinds of grammatical words can be used as the initial elements in focusing clauses as in relative clauses; i. e. *that, who, which, when, where, etc.*: the zero-form is also possible (Collins 1991: 35, Table 3. 2). When *who* or *which* is selected in the focusing clause, it must usually agree, as in the restrictive relative clause, with the focused element with respect to 'human—non-human' distinction (e. g. *It was Mrs Kennedy who/ * which drew the crowds*).

- (2) If the focused element in the cleft sentence is a nominal phrase which will be picked up as the subject of the focusing clause, an agreement in person and number is usually involved between this phrase and the verb as in a restrictive relative clause (e. g. *it is not they who are young but I who am old*).

Dissimilarities

- (1) It is clear from the above formula that, unlike relative clauses, focusing clauses cannot be realized as nonfinite clauses (e. g. *the absence of reliable data from which to draw conclusions*).
- (2) The focused elements of cleft sentences are much more varied than the antecedents of relative clauses in regard to their word class variety. Not only noun phrases but also prepositional phrases, adverbial phrases or clauses and sometimes even adjectival phrases may be the focus of this construction; furthermore, as one kind of noun phrase, even proper names may be focused (e. g. *If ..., then it is Sir Thomas More whom they would perhaps choose*).
- (3) Despite the fact that a similar range of grammatical words is used as clause-initiating elements, the distribution of them between the two types of clause is significantly different. In the cleft sentence, it is **THAT** that dominates the scene (according to Collins, about two thirds of his examples use **THAT**, though this figure must be taken with a pinch of salt since it includes another kind of **THAT**, as will be made clear in the next chapter 3). It is this very point that has a special relevance to our investigation at hand.
- (4) The clause-initiating elements functioning as the subjects of focusing clauses may be realized in a very colloquial style as zero-forms (e. g. *It's not everyone gives up a promising army career at twenty-five in favour of being a night flunkey*).
- (5) Certain elements which have been focused can further be fronted to the beginning of a sentence as a result of double thematization (e.g. *He it was who built Saint Paul's Church in Stoke Road himself at his own expense*).

Another point to be made clear here is the function of **IT** in this construction. Again, contrary to Bolinger's claim (1977: 71ff.), it is not an anaphoric pronoun, in that it does not "refer to some fact already broached (p. 67)" in the preceding text, but it is just a slot filler. This is seen from examples like 1 below, where no fact has been broached in

the preceding text because, the sentence being the opening part of a newspaper article (in *The Independent*), there cannot be any such text.

1. It was *Der Rosenkavalier* that Goran Jarfelt was staging for Welsh National Opera when he died in 1989.

Below are some examples which display the formal features of the cleft sentence described above. ²⁾

2. The Visigoths of the lower Danube area...were originally employed to regain what is now Spain from other Germanic adventurers; but as the collapse of Roman rule became imminent, they created their own empire there. But Roman ways lived on. The Visigoths were rapidly Christianised. Above all, they adopted Latin; at first for writing, later in speech. It is their version of spoken Latin that forms the basis of the Spanish language.
3. it was /Norma [⊥]Harley that did _△ most of the _△TALKING(↘)//... /she and Mark _△Toomy have made _△most of the EN_△QUIRIES(↘↗)// /but [ə:] _△Mark [⊥] obviously _△briefed her to [⊥]ask [ð i:] relevant QUESTIONS(↘)// (S. 3. 2)
4. A : it was [⊥]/JOHNNY(↘↗) that [⊥]stole her ə m MONEY(↘)// /while we were A_△{WAY(↘)} in _△FRANCE(↘) I THINK(↗)// /WASN'T(↘) it//...
—(two more turns)—
B : you /spend your [⊥]life _△looking AFTER (↘) these kids // and / they _△TURN(↘) ROUND(↗)// and /nick your _△last PENNY(↘)//—
(S. 2. 13)
5. it's the — /academic _△STRUCTURE(↘)// • /of • the UNI_△VERSITY(↘)// that • that [ə] • // /WE'RE(↘) CONCERNED (↗) about// (S. 1. 2)
6. But we must not forget that Latin...had different varieties, just as many classical writers themselves could not overlook the differences that were emerging between their metropolitan written usage...and the local...or popular...Latin which was to provide the basis for Christian writings in the following centuries. Classical Latin is certainly of great importance in the history of English, but it

is on the spoken Latin, not of Rome, but of the Imperial provinces, that we must now concentrate.

7. A major function of all towns was to raise enough cash to pay for the standing armies that were so essential to the maintenance of the Empire. It is in these armies that we can see the conditions for the genesis of new, local varieties of Latin. Drawing their complements from speakers of many different languages, the armies fostered Latin as a lingua franca: and it is likely that the spoken Latin of the soldiery bore the imprints of numerous mother-tongues, as a process of pidginisation occurred.
8. It is not until we reach the times of Domesday that we find there and in related documents a correlation of hides, virgates and acres which allows an equation to be made. In several instances in Cambridgeshire proper, in the isle of Ely and in Essex it is possible to say that the reckoning then was 120 acres to the hide. In parts of Wessex on the other hand the hide seems to have contained no more than 40 acres.
9. This is part of the process of being in a subordinate position. It is because the subordinates are more powerful that they impose their own way of thinking (and their language) as the only valid one.

In 2 to 5, the focused elements are noun phrases: more than that, they are proper names in 3 and 4. The noun phrases in the first three examples are picked up in the focusing clauses as the subjects of these clauses and the one in 5 as the object of preposition. Both in 6 and 7, the focused elements are realized as prepositional phrases; but their functions are different: in 6, it is the object of the prepositional verb while in 7, it is the adjunct of the clause. In 8 and 9, the focused elements are adverbial clauses functioning as ‘adjuncts’ as opposed to ‘disjuncts’ (Greenbaum 1969). *That* in example 2, if taken in isolation, shows every sign of being a relative (and so does the one in example 5), but the fact that *it* in this example is not an anaphoric pronoun, as can be seen from its relation with the preceding text, excludes that reading (this is so with example 5 too). The rest of the examples do not have any parallel use in ordinary relatives.

These examples can be taken as typical illustrations of the cleft sentence. They show that this construction has syntactic features which are simultaneously similar and dissimilar to those of the restrictive relative clause. Where do these dissimilarities come

from? I consider that they come from peculiar syntactic functions of THAT which dominates the scene of a cleft sentence construction. This point will be made clearer as a conclusion later in this paper (in 2. 3.). But before moving on to it, I must deal with another equally important (probably more important in the whole picture of this construction) issue of the information structure of the *it*-cleft sentence.

2.2. Information structure in the cleft sentence

The problem first to be addressed here is this: what kind of information is focused in this construction? Contrary to the view still held by many grammarians,³⁾ it is not only the information which has been introduced for the first time in the text, but also the kind of information which is already given and often contrastive to the one which could have been conveyed by some other candidate element(s). This is clear from example 4 above: here the focused element (i. e. *JOHNNY*) is one of the heads of the tone unit with a ‘fall—rise’. What is meant by these prosodic features is that the information conveyed by this element is given in the preceding text and is contrasted with some other person(s).⁴⁾ In fact, *Johnny* has been referred to in the previous portions of this conversation as “*one of these (three) kids*” (actually three brothers), as in the subsequent text, or as “*(he is) a real vicious swine (, that number)*”, but the name itself appears here for the first time (hence a heavy stress). This proper name is placed in the slot ‘X’ in the above formula to be put into contrast with some other competing element(s). So, this sentence can be paraphrased as something like *Of the three brothers we’re talking about, Johnny was the one who stole her money.*

What has been discussed so far also applies to example 3. Its only difference from example 4 is that here the focused element is not a head of the tone unit. So, the question of “Who is this *Norma Harley*” does not arise at all. Its referent is assumed to be known (extralinguistically) from the start to all the participants of this conversation and more importantly this time it is not contrasted at all with anybody else. The paraphrase of this example will be, therefore, *As expected, Norma Harley, not anybody else, did most of the talking.*⁵⁾ The reason why she was expected, as a matter of course, to do most of the talking is given in the subsequent text.

As far as some of our written examples are concerned, it seems to be contrastive information of this kind which often gives the basis of focusing. In examples 2 and 7, for instance, it is particularly information conveyed by *their* and *these* respectively that is

the focus of contrast. With a sizeable proportion of written examples, it would seem that the focused elements are thus often assumed to be known from the outset and contrasted to some other candidate(s) which could have been likewise focused. But what about example 6 (i. e. *it is on the spoken Latin, not of Rome, but of the Imperial provinces, ...*)? Strictly speaking, nothing is new here again, because the only candidate *spoken* is inferable from the preceding text as contrasted to *Classical*. (Another reading will be given below.)

Put differently, the focused elements in these written examples are the bearer of given information. In contrast, their focusing clauses convey new information, which is often used as the jumping board for the subsequent texts. Example 7 clearly displays this pattern of the flow of information around a cleft sentence, showing that what has been first mentioned in the focusing clause is then picked up and enlarged upon in the subsequent text. It seems that, looked at from the viewpoint of information structure, many cleft sentences in written English are used for the purpose explained so far.

Of course this pattern of the flow of information around a cleft sentence is not monopolized by written language. In the above spoken examples 3 and 4, the focusing clauses are realized with their own tone-unit heads on the intonation pattern of 'fall'. And the new information thus introduced there is further enlarged upon in the subsequent texts, as is clear from example 4.

The pattern of information structure discussed so far is not the only possibility in a cleft sentence. Between the outer introductory and the inner focusing clauses, there exist theoretically three possible combinations with regard to the distribution of 'given — new' information.

	Outer clause	Inner clause
(A)	given	new
(B)	new	new
(C)	new	given

Given the communicative function of language on which this distribution of information is based, the fourth possibility, namely the combination of 'given — given', would seem

a logical absurdity, especially in this construction.

The pattern of information structure examined so far corresponds to Category (A) in the above figure. In this category of cleft sentence, the number of tone units involved in spoken examples has been mostly one (see again examples 3 and 4).

However, as can be seen from example 5, the number of tone units involved in a cleft sentence can be more than one. In fact, according to Collins' survey of the London-Lund spoken corpus (1991: 156-7), the number of instances in which a cleft sentence consists of more than one tone unit far exceeds the number of instances in which it is realized by a single tone unit (113 vs 74). In this multi-tone-unit type of cleft sentence, the outer and inner clauses are alike realized by one or more than one tone unit of their own. With regard to the pattern of information distribution, the type most frequently found in this group is reported to be that of 'new — new' (i. e. our Category (B)), with the intonation pattern of 'fall + fall' (46 instances), exemplified by the next example 10.

10. SO(↘)//although [ə] I could imagine that we {COULD(↘)} • [ə:m] • on our joint SALARY (*sic*)//get perhaps quite a a a high MORTGAGE(↘↗)//it's the paying it back at the BEGINNING(↘)//•that's going to be DIFFICULT(↘)//⁽⁶⁾

Our written examples 1, 8 and 9 belong with example 10 in that they contain in their respective outer clauses (i.e. *It was Der Rosenkavalier*, *It is not until we reach the times of Domesday*, and *It is because the subordinates are more powerful*) completely new information elements denoted particularly by *Der Rosenkavalier*, *the times of Domesday*, and *powerful* and in their respective focusing clauses information not previously given.

Compared with examples of Category (B), those of Category (A), namely those which have the information distributed on the pattern of 'given—new', with the intonation pattern of 'fall—rise + fall', are reported to be much fewer in number (7 instances). Probably they are more common in written English, with another possible exception of example 6, if the information conveyed by the whole phrase *the spoken Latin, not of Rome, but of the Imperial provinces* is considered as new.

Then, what about Category (C)? Example 5 seems to fit the bill, with the focused element carrying a 'fall' and the focusing clause ending on the intonation pattern of 'fall + rise'. But I am not sure how often this category is exemplified by real examples; for it does seem that the pattern of information distribution realized by sentences of this

type (i. e. ‘new’ + ‘old’) intuitively runs counter to the general tendency that texts are built up linearly and cumulatively along the time dimension (this is more so, given the fact that, as will be mentioned later in 2. 3. , the two clauses forming a cleft sentence are generally thought to be highly independent of each other).

The next example, which contains two instances of cleft sentence, looks as if it falsifies this tendency in that, in the second cleft sentence, the word *FORWARD* which constitutes the nucleus of the focusing clause with a ‘fall’ has nevertheless been mentioned already in the first cleft sentence: that is to say, this clause may seem not to have any new information.

11. B : I sup / pose it would \triangle go to the \triangle board of \triangle STUDIES (\searrow)
 { /WOULDN'T(\searrow) it// } // /REALLY(\searrow \nearrow)//
 A : \sharp /NO(\searrow)// • /boards of studies \triangle don't • don't \triangle DEAL(\searrow) with RECOGNITION(\nearrow)// /this is a — \triangle { /bloody \sharp COMPLICATED(\searrow \nearrow) } UNIVER-SITY(\searrow)// [\emptyset] /it's • /it's/ [∂ i ∂ i] /faculty in the SCHOOL(\nearrow \searrow)// — { that that /puts you FORWARD(\rightarrow)// } // you /SEE(\nearrow)// • /so that it's the \triangle faculty of ARTS(\nearrow)// • [\emptyset] /or the faculty of ECONOMICS(\nearrow)// / or BOTH (\nearrow) // with / in the NF \triangle O(\searrow)// that' ll be /putting him \triangle FORWARD(\searrow)// (S. 1. 2)

What must be noted here is the difference in the pitch movement between the two *FORWARD*'s in the two cleft sentences: the first is realized with a ‘level’ tone and the second with a ‘fall’. The level tone in the former seems to suggest that the speaker A presents the information contained in this sentence not as his own contribution to the dialogue but as the information ultimately derived from the *university* authorities. In short, this information happens to be imparted through his mouth: he is acting just as a mouthpiece of a third party. This reading seems to be supported by the pitch movement on the focused element *SCHOOL*, namely a ‘rise—fall’ instead of a ‘fall’, which does seem to suggest that the speaker A is imparting the well-established fact from the position of power derived from the *university* authorities (hence *You see?* at the end). It appears that we are witnessing here an illustration of what Brazil calls “oblique orientation” (1985: Ch. 8). If this is really the case, the second *FORWARD* is seen to have a very different communicative value in that it is uttered as A's own contribution of information to the

dialogue (note *so that* at the beginning): that is, it carries new information from his own point of view (hence a ‘fall’ on it). For the reasons discussed so far, this cleft sentence cannot be considered to belong to Category (C).

Collins says (pp. 175-6) that a more normal pattern of Category (C) type is found in examples like 12 below, in which focusing clauses are not superficially realized.

12. A : ... [ə:m] • now / what was the OTHER (↘) thing { I /wanted to
 △ASK (→) you// } • / [i] / is • / is it [△] this YEAR (↘) // that [ə :]
 /NIGHTINGALE(↘) goes// — — —
 B : [ə :] no /NEXT(↘) year// — —
 A : [ə:m] • /sixty- [f] -four SIXTY-FIVE(↘)//
 B : //SIXTY-FIVE(↘)// /YEAH(↘)//
 A : I thought it was BE/FORE(↘) sixty-five // so it's /not until — △next
 year that the job will be △ADVERTISED(↘)// (S. 1. 1)

This example is very interesting in that the two types of cleft sentence already examined above occur at the same time. The first cleft sentence is an illustration of Category (B) and the second of Category (A). Collins says that, on top of these, it is possible to spot another instance of cleft sentence here, that of Category (C). According to him, *it was BEFORE sixty-five* is an elliptical version of cleft sentence in which the focusing clause (i.e. *that Nightingale goes*) has not been realized since it need not be (about this type of ellipsis, see Young 1980: 149, Quirk et al 1985: 349). He does not deny that there is another reading of this example possible; that is, *it* in this sentence is an anaphoric pronoun referring to ‘the time that Nightingale goes’. And this is the right reading of the sentence in question: for, how can IT refer to, or fill the place for, something that is not present? If IT in the cleft sentence is a cataphoric pronoun, as is claimed to be the case by Quirk et al, something must always be present to be cataphorically referred to. If it is a place filler, as is claimed to be the case in this paper, something must always be there to be filled the place for. In short, *it was BEFORE sixty-five* in the above example is not an instance of cleft sentence.

I suspect that cleft sentences belonging to Category (C) are rather few in number, since the pattern of information carried by these sentences basically runs counter to the general trend mentioned above.

2.3. Conclusion

As is generally accepted (Huddleston 1984: 462), the cleft sentence consists of two highly independent clauses, neither of which is embedded into the other. This is why the focusing clause cannot be realized, unlike the restrictive relative clause, as a nonfinite clause. The predominant use of *THAT* in this construction comes from the fact that it is the only word that can be used both as a relative and as a paratactic conjunction. In this sense, the cleft sentence is an example of syntactic blend. The blend is made possible because, as a grammatical word, the function of *THAT* is highly versatile: as a relative, it can pick up a much wider range of antecedents than other relatives, and as a conjunction which can connect clauses paratactically as in complementation, it can show that the cleft sentence consists of two highly independent clauses. In other words, *THAT* is used here, on the one hand, to connect a clause to a phrase just as a relative *THAT* does and, on the other, to connect two independent clauses, just as a conjunction *THAT* does in complementation. No other word in English could serve this double function. Also, since the two clauses forming a cleft sentence are thus highly independent of each other, the information conveyed by the inner focusing clause tends to be new (especially in written examples), following the general trend of the flow of information which is linearly and cumulatively built up along the time dimension.

3. A peculiar construction with an adverbial *that*-clause

In this paper one more type of *that*-clause will be examined, partly because it has not been given enough attention in grammars despite its frequent use (Bolinger 1972 is the sole exception) and partly (more importantly here) because it is often wrongly interpreted, sometimes as a content clause (Halliday 1994) and sometimes, as will be seen below, as a variation of focusing clause in the cleft sentence. As a matter of fact, it is an adverbial clause of 'reason'.

3.1. A variety of examples

The construction involving this type of *that*-clause, in fact, is described by Collins (1991: 34-36) as a subtype of cleft sentence. According to him, the only major formal difference between the two constructions is that this one does not have a focused element before a *that*-clause. He further says as follows: "The superordinate clause may select modality, aspect and polarity, and may include a 'focusing adverb' (*only, just*, and so on) between

the copula and the highlighted element... (p. 34)". So his formula for this construction will be as follows:

It is [was] /Mod—(have)—BE/ (+ not) (+ Adv) + *That* + Finite clause
(Mod=modal verbs)

The problem to be addressed here is whether this construction is really a subtype of cleft sentence, as is claimed by Collins. First, let us look at some examples that answer to the above formula in order to see how they differ from the cleft sentence. ⁷⁾

13. Yes. I can see how this would be seen as perverse. Your mother was not acting according to the spirit of the times. She could have made a hundred thousand or so. Was it that she was ecologically minded, like your brother?
14. Anyway...Tim and I are just simply out of sync at the moment—I can't think how else to put it. We're not connecting. Don't worry—we're not going to split up, at least I trust not... It's not that we don't love each other... Within the context of how long we've been together...
15. It was not so much that he had anything against people in general, more that he saw no purpose in deliberately setting up occasions on which you stood around trying to think of something to say.
16. The units which are basic to the primary articulation of language are thus distinguished and identified by combinations of smaller units, letters and phonemes. Moreover, these combinations are in turn subject to rule. A native English word cannot begin, for example, with the consonants *cv* [kv] , although it could begin with *cl*, *qu* [kw] or the like. It is not merely that a word such as *cvab* ([kvæb] or [kvɒb]) does not happen to exist.
17. b : / [m] // — — — you got a /COLD(↗) //
 A : — ¹ /NO(↘) // • just a /bit △SNIFFY(↘) // cos I'm—I ¹ /AM(↗) COLD(↘) // and I'll / be all right ¹ once I've warmed UP(↘) // — do I /LOOK(↘) as though I've got a △COLD(↗) //
 b : no I /thought you SOUNDED(↘) as if you were
 A : / [m] // — — — I /always DO(↘) a bit actually // /CHRONICALLY(↘) // —(two more turns) —

b : — — — /pull your CHAIR(↘) up close if you WANT(↗) //...

A : / YES(↘) // • ¹ / I'll be all ¹ right in a MINUTE(↗) // it's /just that I'm
 △STUPID(↘) //... (S. 1. 3)

18. But make the most of the next few weeks, for it may be that the planning and the looking-forward are the best part of the holiday, with nothing to spoil the idyll of white sands and blue skies in the mind.

3.2. Two different constructions with similar surface forms

As was made clear earlier, the cleft sentence is a syntactic blend in which some features of a relative clause and a content clause merge together. By contrast, in the above examples, there is no feature of a relative clause present. To be sure, the two elements '*it + be*' and '*that*' are shared by this construction and the cleft sentence. But the similarity ends there.

Then, are all the *that*-clauses in the above examples content clauses? Only one is. As was explained in my doctoral thesis (Chapter 6), example 18 belongs with constructions with outer-clause verbs like SEEM, TURN OUT, etc., in which IT is a grammatical dummy.

But, when it comes to the other examples, the story changes drastically. They are examples of a construction basically different from that of example 18. So, it emerges that two different constructions are mixed together in Collins' formula. Firstly, as can be seen from examples 13, 14 and 16, *it's* point back to the situations described in the preceding texts: e. g. *(the situation) that Tim and I are just simply out of sync at the moment; (the fact) that a native English word cannot begin with the consonants cv [kv]*. They are true pronouns whose referents can be traced back in the preceding texts. Secondly, the *that*-clauses in question are adverbial in nature, with THAT having a meaning similar to BECAUSE. That these clauses are adverbial can be seen from the fact that they themselves can be the focus of a cleft sentence: e.g. *It's not that we don't love each other that we are just simply out of sync at the moment*. The content of the second *that*-clause in this paraphrase is usually presented as part of the preceding text and then picked up by the referring pronoun IT. As is often the case with discourse anaphoric pronouns, it can be rather difficult to tell exactly what portion of the preceding text is referred to by IT. But even with example 17, this paraphrasing test seems to work: it can be paraphrased as something like *It's just that I'm stupid*

that I may look as though I've got a cold. As these paraphrases show us, polarity and focusing adverbs in these examples have nothing to do with the focused element of cleft sentence.

Here a problem arises as to why the pronoun in question is always IT, whose function could be likewise performed by a similar pronoun THAT. Part of the reason should lie in the fact that there is a basic distinction of anaphoric—deictic nature between IT and THAT. What is required in this construction is that the pronoun should be anaphoric, referring to (part of) the preceding text. Another part of the reason should be that if IT was replaced by THAT, this construction would have two THAT's, which could appear cheek by jowl in many cases (i.e. **Was that that she was ecologically minded, ... ?*). Put differently, if the conjunction was not THAT but BECAUSE, IT could always be replaced by THAT without causing any problem (i.e. *Was that because she was ecologically minded, ... ?*). The choice of pronoun thus seems to be lexically constrained right from the start.

As has been seen so far, what Collins has wrongly analysed as a subtype of cleft sentence without a focused element actually comprises two constructions basically different from each other. Neither of them is an instance of cleft sentence. As the first construction, exemplified by 18 above, has already been taken care of in my doctoral thesis (Chapter 6),⁸⁾ the second alone will be schematically shown below.

<i>It is/was + not</i>	}	+ That + Finite clause
<i>It is/was + Adv</i>		
<i>Is/ Was it</i>		

(THAT is an adverbial conjunction.)

As is implied in the above formula, *that*'s in examples 13 to 17 cannot be omitted, just as other types of adverbial THAT cannot be realized as zero-forms (e. g. *God hides that we may seek Him*). And this fact would seem to provide a handy diagnostic test of whether a given *that*-clause in question is an adverbial clause or a content clause. When THAT is not superficially realized, the clause cannot but be read as a content clause, even if its surface form is identical in every other respect to that of an adverbial clause. This can be seen from examples like the one below.

19. Now we don't want you to lose sympathy with either Harry or Natalie, espe-

cially Natalie ... because up till then they both of them had been trying to do the right thing, be serious and responsible people. It's just life gets boring, doesn't it? ⁹⁾

In the above example, the subject *it* does not refer to any preceding situation in the text: so, it is an anticipatory IT. This example, therefore, can be paraphrased as something like *The only thing is, life gets boring, doesn't it?* What this example would seem to suggest is that no clause fails to lose an adverbial reading when it drops THAT.

3.3. Conclusion

It has been shown above that the examples which have been considered by Collins as a subtype of cleft sentence actually comprise two constructions, both basically distinct from the cleft sentence, one of which contains an adverbial clause of reason, as has been reformulated above. Yet his misreading tells a great deal about the use of various types of *that*-clause: when THAT is in full play, it can never be dealt with so easily.

NOTES

1. The term “content clause” has been borrowed from Jespersen (*MEG* III: 23-4):

“I venture to coin this new term for clauses like the one in “(I believe) *that he is ill*”. Such clauses are generally termed “noun clauses” (or “substantive clauses”, Curme), but the name is not very felicitous, because these clauses are not really nouns or substantives, but have only one quality in common with substantives, namely that of being able to stand as primaries...”

My basic standpoint on this type of clause is that, as the insights shown in the above remarks suggest, it is not a “nominal” clause “embedded” in or “subordinate” to a main clause, but it itself is a main clause paratactically conjoined to another outer clause. The main grammatical function of THAT, therefore, is to show that there exists a paratactic relationship between the two (or more than two) clauses connected by this word. In this sense it is claimed that its original grammatical function is still preserved. For details, see my doctoral thesis (Part 2).

2. Examples 2, 6 and 7 are from D. Leith: *A Social History of English*, example 8 from P. H. Blair: *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England* and example 9 from S. Romaine: *Language in Society*. All spoken examples (not only 3, 4 and 5 cited here but also 11, 12 and 17 cited later in this paper) are from J. Svartvik & R. Quirk (eds.): *A Corpus of English Conversation*; they have been a little simplified and some of their prosodic features have had to be sacrificed mainly because of the printer’s technical limitations. Those prosodic features which have been preserved are as follows:

CAPITAL LETTERS	: The head of a tone unit
//	: The end of a tone unit
/	: The onset of a tone unit
{ }	: A subordinate tone unit
△	: A syllable higher in pitch than the preceding syllable
△	: A syllable higher in pitch than the preceding pitch-prominent syllable
⊥	: A normal stress
⌚	: A heavy stress
•	: A brief pause (corresponding to one light syllable)
—	: A unit pause (corresponding to one stress unit)

Since the pitch movement cannot be technically superscribed as in the original, it is

shown in brackets just after the head of a tone unit like FORWARD (↘).

3. See, for example, the following remarks made by Lambrecht (1994: 70-71):

“It is generally assumed that in order for this construction (i.e. the *it*-cleft construction) to be used appropriately, the proposition expressed in the relative clause must be pragmatically presupposed, i.e. assumed by the speaker to be known to the addressee. This is what Borkin (1984: Appendix B) calls the “grammatical meaning” of the *it*-cleft construction... Thus, if I utter the sentence *It’s my keys that I lost*, I normally presuppose in my addressee the knowledge that I lost something and I assert that the thing which I lost is my keys.”

According to this statement, the *it*-cleft sentence cannot but be the bearer of the information always distributed between its two clauses on the pattern of ‘new’ + ‘old’ in my wording: i.e., the information conveyed by the focused element is always new, while the one conveyed by the focusing clause is always old. Although Lambrecht himself admits another pattern of information distribution in this construction in which the focusing clause can carry new information, yet the information conveyed by the focused element is claimed to remain new. It will become clear that this interpretation is completely wrong, as will be shown by real examples in this analysis. Also, his example, cited in isolation, which can be transcribed as *It’s my KEYS(↘) that I lost*, can be read in two ways: one as an example of cleft sentence and the other as an example of restrictive relative clause, with *it* functioning as an anaphoric pronoun referring to something which has been mentioned in the previous situation.
4. About the pragmatic distinction between the two types of pitch movement, one of ‘fall’ and the other of ‘fall—rise’, Brazil says as follows (1985: 106-7):

“Very informally, we may say that the constituent that has a ‘fall—rise’ is already in play, conversationally: it is what we are talking about. The constituent that has the ‘fall’ is something freshly introduced into the conversation... it is the tone unit having the ‘fall—rise’ that contains what has been raised already, that with a ‘fall’ that contains the news.”
5. Strictly speaking, the explanation given in the text should be read as a shorthand for the one like the following: “An element of information, lexicogrammatically denoted by *Norma Harley*, which is contained in the whole information conveyed by a proposition “Norma Harley did most of the talking” as its subject-argument, is assumed to be already known extralinguistically to all the participants of the conversation”.
6. This example is cited in Collins 1991: 157 from the London-Lund Corpus S. 8. 1.
7. Examples 13 to 15 are from P. Lively: *Passing On*, example 16 from P. H. Matthews: *Morphology*, and example 18 from P. Toynbee in *Radio Times*.
8. Examples like 18 are formularized as the following in my thesis (6. 3. 1.):

IT + X : That-clause

In this formula, *IT* is a grammatical dummy, just filling the subject position and 'X' is realized by verbs like SEEM, HAPPEN or TURN OUT or more often by the full verb BE (with the meaning similar to 'HAPPEN') which is often modalized by MAY/MIGHT, MUST, CAN or COULD. *That*-clause of this kind is surely extraposed to sentence-final position but it retains independence from the preceding components '*IT* + X'; hence a colon is used to show this relation.

9. This example is from F. Weldon: *The Heart of the Country*.

References

- Bolinger, D. (1972): *That's That*, Mouton
- Bolinger, D. (1977): 'Another glance at main clause phenomena', *Language* 53, 511-519
- Brazil, D. (1985): *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English*, University of Birmingham *Discourse Analysis Monograph*, no. 8
- Collins, P. C. (1991): *Cleft and Pseudo-Cleft Constructions in English*, Routledge
- Greenbaum, S. (1969): *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*, Longman
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994): *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Edward Arnold (2nd ed.)
- Huddleston, R. (1984): *Introduction to the Grammar of English*, Cambridge University Press
- Jespersen, O. (1909-49): *A Modern English Grammar*, George Allen & Unwin
- Lambrecht, K. (1994): *Information Structure and Sentence Form*, Cambridge University Press
- Quirk, R. et al (eds.) (1985): *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, Longman
- Sekine, F. (1996): *Clause Combining in Contextual Grammar in English*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham
- Young, D. J. (1980): *The Structure of English Clauses*, Hutchinson

Two Types of *That*-clause 日本語梗概

関 根 文 夫

この小論は、著者が1996年に英国の Birmingham 大学に提出した博士論文の続きを成すものである。この博士論文においては、いわゆる名詞節と呼ばれる *That* 節が大きく採り上げられたが、その主旨は、既に Jespersen によって看破されていたように、この節は決して名詞的ではなく、この節が文章中に占める位置によってそのように見えるに過ぎない、という点の主張にあった。従って、この *That* 節は、従来言われてきたように、他の要素（例えば *say, think* といった動詞）に従属しておらず、それ自体独立していると考えなければ、多くの言語事実は十分に説明されえない、というのが著者の立場であった。

本論で採り上げた2種類の *That* 節は、上記の *That* 節に形の上でよく似ている。1つは分裂文 (Cleft sentence) と呼ばれるもので、日本の中等教育ではよく '*It... that...*の強調構文' として知られるものであり、*It is in New York that I first met her.* のような文に代表される。他の1つは特定の名称を持たないが、実際の英語ではかなり頻度の高い構文で、*It is not that I don't love her.* のような文に代表される。この2つの例文で分かる通り、両者は最も頻繁に使用される *That* 節に形態上似ているし (例えば *It is clear that the two arguments do not meet at all.* といったような文)、さらに前者は、関係代名詞としての *That* にもしばしば似ており、従って一般に関係代名詞として扱われている。

この形態上の相似からくる、両構文についての誤った解釈を、実際の例の分析を通して正すのが、この小論の1つの大きな目的である。本論中ではまず、第1の構文で特に問題となる、この文がどのような情報の伝達手段として使われているか、という点に焦点を当て、現在主流を成している言語学者たちの解釈を批判した。さらに第2の構文に関しては、現在までほとんど満足な研究もなされていないのが実情であり、従って、今参考になる解釈は甚だピントのずれたものである。これら個々の言語事実の解明をまず行い、さらにそこから翻って、両構文を一般の *That* 節に関する著者の見解と関連させることによって、博士論文での主張をさらに裏付けようというのが本論の最終的な目的である。